1	Russell Davis (SBN 177959)	
2	PACIFIC JUSTICE INSTITUTE 29 Lakewood Ave.	
	San Francisco, CA 94127	
3	Tel. (415) 310-6575	
4	rdavis@pji.org	
5	Kevin T. Snider (SBN 170988)	
6	PACIFIC JUSTICE INSTITUTE	
7	ksnider@pji.org P.O. Box 276600	
	Sacramento, CA 95827	
8	Tel. (916) 857-6900 Fax (916) 857-6902	
9	ksnider@pji.org	
10	Attorneys for Plaintiffs	
11	Thorneys for I tunings	
12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT	OF CALIFORNIA
	GELDVA KEENE MELODY EOLDYEN A MADK	G N 422 01507 10W
14	SELINA KEENE, MELODY FOUNTILA, MARK) MCCLURE,	Case No.: 4:22-cv-01587-JSW
15		
16	Plaintiffs,)	DECLARATION OF RUSSELL DAVIS IN REBUTTAL TO DEFENDANTS'
17	v.	OPPOSITION TO THE EX PARTE APPLICATION TO SHORTEN TIME
18	CITY AND COUNTY OF SAN FRANCISCO;	Date: September 23, 2022
19	LONDON BREED, Mayor of San Francisco in her)	Time: 9:00 a.m.
	official capacity; CAROL ISEN, Human Resources Director, City and County of San Francisco, in her	Judge: Jeffrey S. White
20	official capacity; DOES 1-100,	
21	Defendants.	
22)	
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28	DAVIS DECLARATION IN REBUTTAL TO DEFENI	DANTS' OPPOSITION TO THE EX PARTE

APPLICATION TO SHORTEN TIME

DECLARATION OF RUSSELL DAVIS

- 1. I am the attorney for Plaintiffs in this matter. I have personal knowledge of the facts in this declaration, and if called to testify about them, I would and could do so competently.
 - 2. I write to correct some obvious mistakes in counsel's opposition declaration.
- 3. Opposing counsel states there is no emergency requiring shortened time. However, in my declaration in support of shortening time I declared the following:

My clients are extremely prejudiced by the lack of a ruling in this matter. My clients had not intended to retire for more than five (5) years. As a result of their constructive firing, their retirement benefits are far lower than anticipated. Their mortgage payments and simple items like buying food, paying for gas and electric and water have now become far more of a burden. As a result, they have contemplated having to sell their homes.

If being forced to sell one's home is not an emergency than I simply do not know what is.

- 4. Opposing counsel claims not to be available on September 23; however, DAVID CHIU (State Bar #189542) and WAYNE K. SNODGRASS (State Bar #148137) are both listed on the moving papers and there is no reason stated why either of them cannot appear.
- 5. Attached as Exhibit 1 herein is a copy of the full email thread from opposing counsel and I. Opposing counsel plainly states that "we do not plan to contest." Yet here we are. It should be obvious that the ex parte application is procedural only and there can be no prejudice to the Defendants if it remains on calendar. Defendants have plenty of time to contest the substantive motion, which is requested to be heard on September 30, 2022.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California that the above is true and correct. Executed on September 22, 2022, in San Francisco, California.

/s/ Russell Davis
Russell Davis
PACIFIC JUSTICE INSTITUTE
Attorney for Plaintiffs

EXHIBIT 1

RE: Keene v CCSF, NDCA Case No.4:22-cv-01587-JSW

From: Kimberlin, Kate (CAT) (kate.kimberlin@sfcityatty.org)

To: loanhound@sbcglobal.net

Cc: Jim.Emery@sfcityatty.org

Date: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 at 11:39 AM PDT

Hi Russell,

The email you sent us with ex parte notice didn't include the papers or the date. So, we didn't know the selected date until you filed yesterday. We do not plan to contest, but would also not want to simply no-show if the court wants appearances.

Very truly,

Kate G. Kimberlin
Deputy City Attorney
Office of San Francisco City Attorney David Chiu
1390 Market Street, Fifth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: 415.554.3847

From: Russell Davis <loanhound@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, September 14, 2022 11:11 AM

To: Kimberlin, Kate (CAT) <Kate.Kimberlin@sfcityatty.org>

Subject: Re: Keene v CCSF, NDCA Case No.4:22-cv-01587-JSW

The dates are on the moving papers. On another point: why would you want to contest this motion?

Russ

On Wednesday, September 14, 2022 at 10:38:10 AM PDT, Kimberlin, Kate (CAT) < kate.kimberlin@sfcityatty.org wrote:

Dear Russell,

Unfortunately, you did not provide us with the date you planned to bring this motion for hearing. Neither Jim nor I are available on the date selected, September 23. Are you able to re-notice for a mutually agreeable date?

Thank you,

Kate G. Kimberlin
Deputy City Attorney
Office of San Francisco City Attorney David Chiu
1390 Market Street, Fifth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94102
Tel: 415.554.3847

From: Russell Davis < loanhound@sbcglobal.net > Sent: Monday, September 12, 2022 6:24 PM

To: 'Russell Davis' < rdavis@pji.org>; 'ksnider@pji.org' < ksnider@pji.org>; Emery, Jim (CAT)

< Jim. Emery@sfcityatty.org>

Cc: Kimberlin, Kate (CAT) < Kate.Kimberlin@sfcityatty.org>

Subject: Re: Keene v CCSF, NDCA Case No.4:22-cv-01587-JSW

I am giving you required notice that I am calendaring an ex parte application to shorten time to serve a motion to enter a ruling on the Plaintiffs motion for preliminary injunction.

Russell Davis, Esq.